Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	08/468,145	ENGEL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	N. M. Minnifield	1645
All Participants: Status of Application: <u>Amendment</u>		
(1) N. M. Minnifield.	(3)	
(2) <u>Thomas A. Cawley, 40,944</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 19 July 2004	Time: <u>9:10 AM</u>	
Type of Interview:		
Part I.		i
Rejection(s) discussed: of record		
Claims discussed: 20-23		
Prior art documents discussed: of record		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
<ul> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.</li> </ul>		
NITA MINAIFIELD PRIMARY EXAMINER		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant	/Applicant's Representative S	ignature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner requested approval to amend claim 20 as set forth in the attached Examiner's amendment to place the application in condition for allowance. The closest prior art does not teach the claimed method of having a solution (cetrorelix, acetic acid and bulking agent) at a pH range between 2.5-3.0; the art teaches a pH of 3.5 to 4.5. The prior art teaches that at such a low pH of 2.5-3.0 the cetrorelix would gelatinize before filtration. In view of these arguments the 103 obviousness rejection has been withdrawn. Claims 20-23 have been alllowed and renumbered 1-4 respectively..